

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15, 17, 19 and new claims 21-27 are pending in this application.

Claims 14, 16, 18, and 20 have been rewritten in independent form, as suggested by the Examiner, as claims new 24-27 respectively and should now be allowable.

The support for the claim amendments is as follows: Claims 1 and 2 (p.12, line 8); new claim 21 (p.11, lines 14-24 to p.12, lines 1-3); Claims 22 and 23 (claims 2 and 21 respectively).

In brief, claims 1 and 2 have been amended to recite 1 to 7 parts by weight of a compatibilizing agent (C) which, as will be explained below, is neither disclosed or suggested by the references. Further, none of the references disclose, as recited in new claim 21 that the compatibilizing agent (C) be selected from the group consisting of oxidized polyolefins, acid-modified polyolefins, hydrogenated styrene-butadiene resins, styrene-ethylene butylene-olefin block copolymer resins and olefin-ethylene butylene-olefin block copolymer resins.

The resin compositions of claims 1 and claims dependent thereon do not require a large amount of a wax or an inorganic filler as an indispensable component so that those are free from slippage and a decrease in heat resistance caused by the wax. Moreover, those do not require an inorganic filler of a specific shape, either, and thus those have numerous advantages that those are free from a decrease in moisture permeability at the folded portion and a damage of the surface of paper products wrapped, or the like (page 5, lines 5 to 12 in the specification).

The resin composition of claim 2 and claims dependent thereon, not only solve the problem of high expense of the foregoing resin compositions as compared with the conventional polyethylene-laminated moisture-proof paper by blending an organic filler, but also solve the drawbacks associated with the conventional moisture-proof paper making use of the moisture-proofness of an inorganic filler, i.e., fatal problems as a wrapping paper such as a decrease in moisture-proofness at the folded part and damage of the surface of paper products wrapped (page 5, line 8 from bottom and page 6, line 1 in the specification).

Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 13 and 17 were rejected over **Yamazaki '252**. The composition of **Yamazaki '252** contains a lot of wax, 10-60%, (see claim 1). The point that the claimed invention intends to eliminate the problems caused by a large amount of a wax such as slippage and a decrease in heat resistance, as stated above, and that the claimed invention provides resin compositions not including a wax as an essential element. **Yamazaki '252** contains a large amount of a wax amounting to 10 to 60% by weight and necessarily involves drawbacks such as slippage and a decrease in heat resistance. That is, it may be safely said that the present invention has solved the problems involved in **Yamazaki '252**.

The claimed invention may contain a wax such as paraffin wax and microcrystallin wax in a smaller amount of 10 parts by weight or less, but it is not as an essential but an optional element (see page 13, lines 1 to 14 in the specification). Therefore, the compatibilizer and the wax should be distinguished from each other.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12, 13 and 17 are rejected over **Shirakura '519**. **Shirakura '519** contains titanium dioxide, from 5 to 60 weight percent. The present invention contains no titanium dioxide. Furthermore, **Shirakura '519** discloses a waterproof resin comprising (a) a polyolefin, (b) a tackifier, and optionally an adhesive resin. The claimed invention essentially differs from **Shirakura '519** in that **Shirakura '519** does not require a compatibilizing agent.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected over **Higuchi '883**. While **Higuchi '883** discloses polyolefins and terpene resins (col. 1, lines 64-65), **Higuchi '883** does not disclose the use of a compatibilizing agent, an element of the invention now claimed.

Claims 1, 5 and 6 are rejected over **Morganelli '909**. **Morganelli '909** discloses a low-density hot melt adhesive comprising 10 to 99.7% polyolefin, 0.85% tackifier, 0-50% wax and 0.1% low density filler. The claimed invention essentially differs from **Morganelli '909** in that **Morganelli '909** does not require a compatibilizing agent.

Claim 10 is rejected over **Shirakura '519** in view of **Morganelli '909**. The applicants disagree about the combination of references because **Shirakura '519** contains a lot of titanium

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/019,301

dioxide, which is not present in the claimed invention. Amended claims 1 and 2 are believed to overcome **Shirakura '519** in combination with **Morganelli '909**.

Claim 11 is rejected over **Shirakura '519** in view of **Gaveske '032**. For the reasons above, we disagree about the combination with **Shirakura '519**. **Gaveske '032** discloses a waterproofing composition comprising a polyolefin polymer and a coumarone-indene resin. The claimed invention essentially differs from **Gaveske '032** in that **Gaveske '032** does not require a compatibilizing agent.

Claims 1, 4-6, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected over **Yazaki '116** in view of **Morganelli '909**. On p.7 of the office action it is stated that **Yazaki '116**, does not disclose the ratios of the components in the composition. Therefore the combination with **Morganelli '909** which does not disclose the now claimed chemical composition, does not create a logical conclusion of obviousness.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.


U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/019,301

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version with markings to show changes made."

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP


James E. Armstrong IV
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 42,266

JAM/kas
Atty. Docket No. **020001**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosure: Version with markings to show changes made

Q:\FLOATERS\JAMIE\02\020001\020001 amdt 5-03

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claims 1 and 2 as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) A resin composition for water-resistant and moisture-proof paper comprising 40 to 75 parts by weight of a polyolefin (A), 25 to 60 parts by weight of a tackifier (B) and ~~0 to 20~~ 1 to 7 parts by weight of a compatibilizing agent (C), the total of (A), (B) and (C) being 100 parts by weight.

2. (Twice Amended) A resin composition for water-resistant and moisture-proof paper comprising 40 to 75 parts by weight of a polyolefin (A), 25 to 60 parts by weight of a tackifier (B) and ~~0 to 20~~ 1 to 7 parts by weight of a compatibilizing agent (C), and 20 to 300 parts by weight of an inorganic filler (D) to the total amount of 100 parts by weight of (A), (B) and (C).